

**Remarks**

Claims 1-17 were pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-7, and 9-11 and 13-17 were rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 6,718,218 to Matheson (hereinafter Matheson) over US Patent 6,614,430 to Rappaport (hereinafter Rappaport); claims 2, 8 and 12 are also rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matheson in view of Rappaport and in further view of US Patent 5,850,539 to Cook (hereinafter Cook). Independent claims 1, 7 and 15 are now amended to better point out the patentably distinct subject matter of the present invention as will be discussed later in detail. All other claims are dependent on these independent claims and will be affected by the amendment to these claims. Some dependent claims have also been individually amended. In addition, three new claims - claims 18-20 have also been introduced and are now pending in the present application.

The present invention relates to the field of custom design development. As discussed in one embodiment of the present invention (Fig. 1 and pages 9-10 generally), this design process consists of two steps. The first step is the capturing of data and the second step is the organization of this data and using it in providing a custom design solution. The gathering of data as discussed generally in the application is facilitated by a variety of different embodiments and the final custom design solution is determined based on the requirements that are captured during the custom design data gathering step. In one embodiment, the captured data will include invariant external constraints and other preexisting issues affecting the final custom design solution and process. This embodiment is discussed on page 10, lines 10-15. As the final design solution is responsive to these constraints and issues, independent claims 1, 7 and 15 are now amended to better reflect this fact.

As stated earlier, the Examiner rejected the above-mentioned independent claims based on Matheson in view of Rappaport. Matheson pertains to information management gathered using a Computer Aided Design (CAD) application. As indicated by the Examiner, Col. 2, lines 18-32 of Matheson makes it clear that the primary purpose of the application is to capture and store various objects and then organize them in a user friendly manner so that applications can later access the information that are contained in objects. The gathered data can include geometry, topology, design notes and non-geometry design information. As the purpose in Matheson is primarily organizational, the data is not in any way analyzed or categorized to provide a design solution as is the case in the present application. In the present application, the gathering and organization of data is only incidental to the main purpose which is providing a design process and/or solution. The amended claims now point out this distinction more clearly.

Examiner correctly also points out that Matheson does not deal with one of the elements of the independent claims in the present application which has to do with the translating step. The Examiner states that Rappaport, however, does provide for this step. The undersigned respectfully disagrees. Rappaport deals with a method and apparatus for mechanical data exchange between parametric CAD systems. In this respect, Rappaport provides means to allow one CAD system to extract data and prepare it to be usable for a second CAD system. This is so that a "lossless exchange" of different data types can be achieved (See Col. 6, in general and Col. 11, lines 25-35). In no way, Rappaport suggests that previously examined data can be analyzed and translated in a way as to obtain a design process or solution. The translating step in the present application, by contrast is not to provide data access and usability between two machines. Therefore, as discussed, neither Matheson, Rappaport or their combination as suggested by the Examiner provide means for providing solutions or design process based on analyzing accumulated data as provided in the present application.

The Examiner further rejects some of the claims over Matheson and Rappoport in view of Cook. Cook deals with an automated system for facilitating creation of compatible rack-mountable component personal computers. The undersigned has examined all sections pointed by the Examiner and cannot see how Cook teaches an information design process in the manner suggested by the present invention. Any design process used in Cook is simply for constructing a rack mountable PC (See Col. 2, generally and Col. 7, lines 5-15).

Consequently, and as discussed above , neither Matheson, Rappoport, Cook or their combination as suggested by the Examiner teaches the novel concepts provided in the specification and claims of the present application as amended.

Amended claims 1-20 now remain pending in the application. Applicants submit that in view of the forgoing remarks, that this application is now in condition of allowance; allowance of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Lily Neff/  
Lily Neff - Attorney  
Reg. No. 38,254

IBM Corporation, IP Law Dept.  
2455 South Rd., M/S P386  
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

Phone: (845) 433-1155  
FAX: (845) 432-9786  
EMAIL: lneff@us.ibm.com